



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,328	03/01/2002	Jeffrey E. Devall	3177-69461	3042

23643 7590 09/02/2003

BARNES & THORNBURG
11 SOUTH MERIDIAN
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204

EXAMINER

MICHALSKY, GERALD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3753

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/087,328

Applicant(s)

DEVALL, JEFFREY E.

Examiner

Gerald A. Michalsky

Art Unit

3753

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-21, 23-26 and 28-34 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 22 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The indicated allowability of claims 3-6, 10-11, and 27 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to DeCapua et al. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

2. In order to complete the interview summary record (paper no. 5), it is noted that claims 1, 7, and 22 discussed during the interview are the same as in the amendment filed August 6, 2003 and the arguments advanced during the interview relative to these claims are presented on page 17 of the amendment. The interview record is regarded as complete.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-13, 22, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by DeCapua et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0112757). DeCapua et al. and this application have different inventive entities. DeCapua et al. is entitled to benefit of the filing date of February 16, 2001, which is the filing date of the provisional application for which priority is claimed. Therefore, the effective filing date of DeCapua et al. under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is February 16, 2001. Claims 1-3, 7, and 12 are

Art Unit: 3753

anticipated by Figures 10-14 of DeCapua et al. Claims 4-6, 8-11, 13, 22, and 27 are anticipated by Figure 14 of DeCapua et al.

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-13, 22, and 27 are further provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-12, 16, and 18 of copending Application No. 10/079,163. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they do not support separate patents. Claims 1-13, 22, and 27 herein are readable on the embodiments claimed in claims 11-12, 16, and 18 of Serial No. 10/079,163, and claims 11-12, 16, and 18 of Serial No. 10/079,163 are readable on the embodiments claimed in claims 1-13, 22, and 27 herein.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.


Art Unit: 3753

7. Claims 14-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
8. Claims 16-21, 23-26, and 28-34 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerald A. Michalsky whose telephone number is (703) 308-1049. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 5:30 AM - 2 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Rivell, can be reached on (703) 308-2599. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.


Gerald A. Michalsky
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753

GM
August 28, 2003